



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,580	06/15/2001	Jacques Mercure	14885-IUS JA/AA/Id	5867
20988	7590	11/03/2004	EXAMINER	
OGILVY RENAULT 1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE SUITE 1600 MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3 CANADA			HU, JINSONG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,580

Applicant(s)

MERCURE ET AL.

Examiner

Jinsong Hu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/22/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1- 27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 12-16 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodersen et al. (US 6,732,100, hereinafter as BR' 100), in view of Brodersen et al. (US 6,266,669, hereinafter as BR' 669).

4. As per claims 1 and 16, BR' 100 teaches the invention as claimed including a computer network for storing user data and sharing at least a part of same among users with permission rights over a network, each of said users having a user identification [col. 1, lines 45-50], the computer network comprising:

a dispatch server, said dispatch server comprising a look-up table, said look-up table providing a relation between a user identification and a cell identification [Figs. 1-2; col. 4, lines 29-44];

Art Unit: 2154

more than one cells, each of said more than one cells comprising, an owner authentication unit, authenticating a local user and providing an owner authentication signal [col. 3, lines 38-50; col. 5, lines 30-43];

a shared database, said shared database comprising said shared data [col. 1, lines 50-53; col. 2, lines 57-60; col. 3, lines 51-65];

a permission database, the permission database comprising a relation between at least one user identification, at least one part of said data and said permission rights [col. 1, lines 55-61; col. 3, lines 25-50];

a shared access authentication unit, connected to said WAN, the shared access authentication unit authenticating a non local user using said permission database and providing a shared access authentication signal [col. 1, lines 55-61; col. 2, lines 7-24 & 33-37]; and

a database manager, connected to at least said owner authentication unit, to said shared access authentication unit, to said permission database and to said shared database, the database manager, receiving a request from a user and providing an access with permission right to at least one part of said shared data of said shared database with said permission rights if an owner authentication signal or if a shared access authentication signal is received [col. 1, 45 – col. 2, line 43].

5. BR' 100 does not specifically teach the network is WAN. However, BR' 669 on the other hand teaches a network is WAN [connection between 301 and 4, Fig. 9]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2154

was made to combine the teaching of BR' 100 and BR' 669 because utilizing BR' 669's WAN in BR' 100's system would improve the functionality of the system by providing service to more users.

6. As per claim 2, BR' 100 teaches a owner database, the owner database being connected to said database manager, the owner database comprising an identification of the database available to a particular user [col. 2, lines 15-23; col. 5, lines 51-53].

7. As per claim 3, BR' 100 teaches a owner resource access manager enabling a local user access to access at least one application, said at least one application using at least one database [col. 2, lines 23-24; col. 4, line 45 – col. 5, line 43].

8. As per claims 4 and 5, BR' 100 teaches the owner resource manager enables said local user to access at least one application, using an interface, said interface comprising at least one function button, each of said at least one function button providing access to one of said at least one application, a list all database available to a user, said list comprising the name of said database available, the owner and the permission status [col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 38-65; col. 4, line 45-50].

9. As per claim 6, BR' 669 teaches at least one database search technique comprises a boolean search [col. 7, lines 3-7].

Art Unit: 2154

10. As per claims 7 and 8, BR' 100 teaches a profile manager enabling a user to modify a permission right for at least one part of his data [col. 4, lines 53-58].

11. As per claim 9, BR' 100 and BR' 669 teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not specifically teach at least one application comprises a calendar. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a calendar in BR' 100/BR' 669's system because doing so would bring convenience to user when user needs time related information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify BR' 100/BR' 669's system with a calendar to make the system friendlier to user.

12. As per claims 12 and 13, BR' 100 teaches a special search engine enabling said user to select a search application, at least one database of said database available and a search data, said special search engine enabling said user to perform a search using said search application with said search data and to update said at least one database with at least one part of the results from said search [col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 38-65; col. 4, line 45-50].

13. As per claims 14 and 15, BR' 100 teaches one of said at least one application comprises a synchronization application enabling a user to synchronize at least two databases and a back-up/restore application, the back-up/restore application enabling a

Art Unit: 2154

user to perform a back-up/restore of at least one database [col. 2, lines 25-37; col. 4, line 45 – col. 5, line 43].

14. As per claims 22-27, since they are method claims of claims 1-8, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-8 above.

15. Claims 10-11 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodersen et al. (US 6,732,100, hereinafter as BR' 100), in view of Brodersen et al. (US 6,266,669, hereinafter as BR' 669) as applied to claims 1-9, 12-16 and 22-27 above, further in view of "Official Notice".

16. As per claims 10 and 11, BR' 100 and BR' 669 teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not teach the step of crating a preference list and address book. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for preference list and address book are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art include preference list and address book with BR' 100/BR' 669's system because it would benefit users by providing more executable function to users.

17. As per claims 17-19, BR' 100 and BR' 669 teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not teach encryption means. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for encryption means is well

Art Unit: 2154

known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art include encryption means with BR' 100/BR' 669's system because it would increase the secure ability of the system.

18. As per claims 20 and 21, BR' 100 and BR' 669 teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not teach an alarm watchdog. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for alarm watchdog is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art include alarm watchdog with BR' 100/BR' 669's system because it would increase the reliability of the system.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

O'Brien et al. (US 6,351,776) discloses a shared resource system ;

Whitmyer, jr. (US 6,049,801) discloses a professional service internet system;

Suzuki et al. (US 6,526,406) discloses a database access system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5932. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

October 25, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100